



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/537,202

06/02/2005

Martin Peter

23298

3445

535

7590

07/16/2007

K.F. ROSS P.C.

5683 RIVERDALE AVENUE

SUITE 203 BOX 900

BRONX, NY 10471-0900

EXAMINER

SUHOL, DMITRY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3725

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/16/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

H

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/537,202	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PETER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Dmitry Suhol	<b>Art Unit</b> 3725	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/2/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.   |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1 and 5, the phrase “especially steel strip” renders the claims indefinite as the meets and bounds of the claim can not be determined since it is not clear if the method and apparatus are intended to be used with solely a steel strip or other metal as well.

Regarding claim 1, there is no antecedent basis for “the strip sample” and “the rolling line”.

Regarding claim 4, there is no antecedent basis for “the upper coiling mandrel”.

Regarding claim 5, there is no antecedent basis for “the lower coiling mandrel” and “the coiling mandrel axis”.

Regarding claim 6, there is no antecedent basis for “the last rolling mill stand”, “the coiling station” and “the plane of an inspection table”.

Regarding claim 7, there is no antecedent basis for “the inlet to the coiling station”.

Regarding claim 9, there is no antecedent basis for "the control axis of the rotating frame".

Regarding claim 10, there is no antecedent basis for "the diameter".

Regarding claim 11, there is no antecedent basis for "the rotating frame".

Regarding claim 12, there is no antecedent basis for "the lower coiling mandrel".

The remainder of the office action considers the claims as best understood.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eibe '623 in view of Drigani et al '445. Eibe is relied upon to teach a rolling mill and method containing most of the claimed elements including, rolling (in stands of figure 2A) and then coiling a metal strip on a down coiler (58, 59, 60 or 61) where the metal strip is inspected in longitudinal segments for rolling anomalies (inspected at inspection bed 137), the strip samples being guided "in line" over a coiling station located below the strip samples (figure 2B) onto an inspection table (137) for free viewing and perusal, where it is considered that the limitation of "in line" is encompassed by Eibe since his

Art Unit: 3725

inspection table is downstream and/or down the production line and connected in line with rolling table (52).

Drigani discloses a coiling apparatus and method which teaches the use of double mandrel coiler which may be swung around 180 degrees (see abstract) and has a pressing roller arm (26) which is swingable in and out and provided with a pressing roller (24). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the claimed invention to have incorporated the double mandrel swingable coiler of Drigani in lieu of the two coiler system of Eibe for the purpose of increased efficiencies and functionality as suggested by Drigani.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dmitry Suhol whose telephone number is 571-272-4430. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Friday 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris Banks can be reached on (571) 272-4419. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3725

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dmitry Suhol/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3725

ds